DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 293 EC 123 588

AUTHOR	Thomas, M. Angele, Ed.
TITLE	Current Issues in Special Education: The 1979 Statesmen's Roundtable.
INSTITUTION	Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va. Information Services and Publications.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	80
CONTRACT	400-76-0119
NOTE	33p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Financial Support; *International Relations; *Labeling (of Persons); *Preschool Education; *Professional Associations
IDENTIFIERS	*Council for Exceptional Children

ABSTRACT

The document includes three papers presented at a roundtable discussion of issues concerning The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and the field of special education. Following an introduction by K. Wyatt, a paper titled "Categorizing Children and Funds" by M. Reynolds addresses the problems associated with categorizing exceptional children and with tying the funding to children who are identified with a label. Dr. Reynolds advocates the funding of personnel or programmatic units which would have great flexibility in delivering services to all high risk children. In "Issues in Early Childhood for the Handicapped," J. Gallagher stresses the value of early childhood programs and outlines the structural problems presenting barriers to the establishment of eary childhood programs. He calls for multidisciplinary approaches to the problem with CEC assuming the leadership in initiating a broad reaching interdisciplinary plan for extending preschool programs for handicapped children. The final paper, "A New International Role for CEC" by S. Ashcroft, makes 11 proposals for increased CEC involvement in international special education leadership. Following each paper are excerpts from discussions by prominent individuals in the field of special education. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED184293

CURRENT ISSUES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION: THE 1979 STATESMEN'S ROUNDTABLE

M. Angele Thomas

Editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.E.C.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ERIC

A product of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children

EC 123588

A product of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children. Publication Date, 1980.

The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under contract no. 400-76-0119. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication the manuscript was submitted to The Council for Exceptional Children for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or HEW.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1
Kenneth E. Wyatt

Categorizing Children and Funds 4
Maynard C. Reynolds
Discussion 9

Issues in Early Childhood for the Handicapped 13
James J. Gallagher
Discussion 16

A New International Role for CEC 21
Samuel C. Ashcroft
Discussion 27

INTRODUCTION

Kenneth E. Wyatt
Georgia State University

On April 27, 1979, a new feature was introduced into the CEC program at the 57th Annual International Convention in Dallas, Texas. A group of some of the most prominent special educators in the United States sat around a large table in the center of Ballroom C. Surrounding this table a broad representation of the CEC membership were seated. They were drawn to the roundtable to hear a discussion of predetermined issues of concern to CEC as an organization and to the field of special education in general.

Participants

Approximately 15 individuals comprised the group around the table. In addition to the current President, President-Elect, and Vice President of CEC, there were also an impressive collection of Past Presidents and Wallin Award winners, including William Geer, Romaine Mackie, James Gallagher, Merle Karnes, Harrie Selznick, Maynard Reynolds, John Kidd, Samuel Ashcroft, Philip Jones, and Harold Perry.

Purpose

The rationale for establishing the Statesmen's Roundtable, an activity which is expected to become a permanent feature of the annual CEC conventions, was multidimensional. The observation has frequently been made that just about the time a CEC president learns enough to make the maximum contribution to the organization, his or her term of office comes to an end. The way in which CEC is organized dictates that past presidents have little or no functional role in the governance and are seldom in a position to make a significant impact on the growth and development of the organization to which they once gave so much of their time and personal effort. Such individuals, together with the Wallin Award winners, represent a resource that CEC can ill afford to squander through neglect. They comprise a pool of some of the finest minds in special education, who have already demonstrated a commitment to CEC and a willingness to serve its interests.

The advantage to CEC of such a gathering is obvious. The value of bringing together in one place, at one time, a group of individuals with this level of experience, expertise, and professional competence is beyond estimate. The opportunity to focus this rich source of professional capital on issues of immediate concern to the field of special education and to the membership of CEC was felt to be of sufficient importance to warrant its instigation in Dallas. Plans were made to repeat the Statesmen's Roundtable at all future conventions

or until the participants themselves feel it has outlived its usefulness. In this way, the group can maintain at least a limited level of involvement with CEC for as long as they like, and they will be assured a place on the convention program whenever, and for as long as, they care to participate.

Process

The format for the first Roundtable called for three of the Statesmen to suggest topics and prepare short papers on a variety of relevant issues. It was decided that two of these would deal with concerns common to the field of special education, and the third would deal with an issue of specific concern to current or future directions for CEC as an organization. During the Roundtable session, after each paper was read, the remaining participants - all of whom had reviewed the paper prior to the convention - were called upon for their comments. These comments were sometimes in conflict with the position taken in the papers, and at other times tended to support or expand upon the concepts contained in the presentation. At the conclusion of the reactions to the paper, questions or comments from members of the audience were also entertained. The entire proceedings were audiotaped for inclusion in this publication.

As a first attempt the Roundtable in Dallas can only be classified as a success. The nature of the issues presented, the quality of the papers, and the discussion which grew from the topics proved to be both stimulating and instructive. At the conclusion of the Roundtable, the participants made suggestions for future topics and discussed ways for the activity to generate even more impact in the years to come.

Positions

The first paper, presented by Dr. James Gallagher, is both timely and provocative. He points out that the importance of early childhood years in the development of exceptional children has been well understood by special educators for many years. The preventive value of early childhood programs is stressed, and concern is expressed by Dr. Gallagher that such programs have not been developed as fast as or to the extent that he feels is warranted. He outlines the structural problems presenting barriers to the establishment of early childhood programs and, finally, he calls for multidisciplinary approaches to the problem with CEC assuming the leadership in initiating a broad-reaching interdisciplinary plan for extending preschool programs for handicapped children.

Dr. Maynard Reynolds' paper addresses the problems associated with categorizing exceptional children and with tying the funding to children who are identified with a label. He advocates instead the funding of personnel or programmatic units which would have great flexibility in delivering services to all manner of high risk

children. His paper supports Dr. Gallagher's in that it promotes the concept of early intervention as a preventive measure. Dr. Reynolds speaks of a broader mission for special educators and stresses the need to share special education's resources with regular education by distributing funds on a systemic basis. Without question, Dr. Reynolds' paper was the most controversial and generated the greatest amount of discussion within the group.

In Dr. Samuel Ashcroft's paper, he discusses a new international role for CEC. Establishing a basis in the goals established for the International Year of the Child, he outlines some premises relative to CEC's international role. Referring to some activities that were suggested during the First World Congress on Future Special Education and reported in the CEC publication International Perspectives on Future Special Education (Fink, 1978), Dr. Ashcroft goes on to recommend 11 proposals he believes CEC should consider. These proposals provide a blueprint for CEC's increased movement into the international arena in which it might assume a position of leadership.

Prognosis

Those of us who were privileged to observe and participate in the first of the Statesmen's Roundtables are impressed with the potential it holds in providing insight and direction to CEC in the future. The identification of areas in which CEC might pursue research grants or develop publications that might have long term benefit for the general membership of CEC is a distinct possibility. For CEC to be of maximum benefit to all of its members, it must remain on the cutting edge of new developments in special education. It must move into a proactive stance relative to professional activities, rather than continually reacting to activities initiated by governmental, parental, or other interest groups. Harnessing the knowledge and wisdom of our past leaders through the Statesmen's Roundtable is one way to accomplish this goal.

We are highly pleased with our first efforts in this respect. As future Roundtables are held, we expect that the process will become more refined and the ultimate benefit will increase. The reader is invited to review the papers and the dialogue presented at the Dallas Roundtable. As future Roundtables occur, it is hoped that you will have the opportunity to observe in person and perhaps to contribute to an understanding of the issues raised.

CATEGORIZING CHILDREN AND FUNDS

Maynard C. Reynolds
University of Minnesota

The Challenge

Although for some purposes it obviously is necessary for special educators to classify and group children and to prepare teachers for categorical functions, we have distorted those purposes in recent decades and, as a result, we now face problems of major dimensions. However well meaning we may have been, our irrational ways of classifying, grouping, tracking, and categorizing children have created mounting problems that promise major difficulties in the near future if we do not change them. Hobbs (1975) warned that nothing less than the "futures of children" are at stake in the ways we classify them; I would add that nothing less than the future of the field of special education, including its professional structures such as CEC, is threatened by the ways we treat the interacting problems of pupil classification and funding.

The Purpose of Classification

The diagnosis and classification of children in the schools ought to be done explicitly and efficiently, for instructional purposes only. Unhappily, we still observe many procedures which, while conducted in the schools, seem oriented to nonschool purposes. The objective of diagnosis and classification in the schools ought to be assigning students to appropriate curricula and instructional systems. In other words, the careful study of children is critical to forming a basis of understanding so that we can teach them competently. Ultimately, the accountability tests in the schools ought to be directed toward two related elements: Was the child well understood? Was he competently taught?

Teachers are employed to make a difference in the development of children. Thus, we always have in mind differences in outcomes depending upon instruction. We are concerned with making choices about how to proceed instructionally and it is in these choices that diagnosis and classification should enter. This concern has little to do with the place where students are educated (e.g., special class v. mainstream) but a great deal to do with whether they receive intensive instruction, a modified curriculum, or some special form of education. There is a contradiction between the traditional special education preoccupation with the diagnosis and classification of children by handicaps and the practice of making educational diagnoses that may involve little attention to handicaps - at least in the cases of children who show only mild or moderate degrees of exceptionality.

The Limits of Present Systems of Classification

The fact is our systems of classification fall far short of what is needed according to the criteria I have been suggesting. The traditional categories (blind, deaf, mentally retarded, mentally ill), which can be traced to the nineteenth century asylums of Europe, dealt mainly with persons who have severe or distinct handicaps. However, they have been expanded to include persons with lesser deviations (hard of hearing, partially sighted, educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed) and extended to very indistinct residual categories (e.g., learning disabilities) for persons who are not responding to ordinary instruction in the common schools.

The newer categories vary from place to place, from time to time, and even with the hours of the day. For example, in some states whole schools are organized for brain injured children, but in Minnesota we have none of them; and you will recall the ominous title of the 1969 report of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation: "The Six Hour Mentally Retarded Child." Burton Blatt tells us of the rubber band approaches to defining mental retardation; incidence was reduced by half in one evening in a smoke filled room.

Many special educators and political leaders seem to take the categories very seriously -- as if they really "carve nature at its joints." All over the country school buses pass each other on dusty country roads and busy urban streets, at high expense, to deposit classified childred at EMH, MBD, or NIEH classes. The more children found and classified in the various categories at local school levels, the more money they receive from state and federal offices. Much of this activity is of doubtful merit!

Listen to the Messages!

How can the message that we need to change be heard more clearly? Consider, if you will, our embarrassment when Congress requested a definition of "Learning Disability." A "trial balloon" formula was produced as a tentative response but it exemplified all the problems of basing educability statements on IQ plus an equation for calculating discrepancy. The final solution is, perhaps, even more problematic: Every school system calculates the discrepancy in its own way. We ought to consider seriously whether the onus for such discrepancies should be placed on the psychologists who set too high expectations for children's performances or on the children who do not live up to such expectations. Special educators charge into each such situation like a Seventh Cavalry ready to repair the discrepancy. But they do so several years too late; the tragedy has already occurred. We are investing our money and energies in learning disabilities after the fact; that is, when the children already have experienced long, discouraging periods of serious failure in the schools. We should have intervened earlier, yet we could not because the traditional labeling and funding processes do not serve preventive purposes.

Consider the California case regarding the classification of Black children as "educable mentally retarded": The courts ruled out use of the usual testing methods by which minority group children have been classified as retarded. Or consider the big cities, where the IEP preparation rate is low despite the fact that, in some schools, more than half of the children probably could meet the eligibility tests in the common handicap categories. The lives and school programs of children probably are in disorder in the big cities more than anywhere else. Special education services simply are not reaching enough of these children. This situation results, perhaps, from the contradictory condition that no administrator can survive if he or she pins traditional special education label on increasing numbers of poor and minority group children; yet administrators frequently earn more money for their schools if such labeling occurs.

Consider the growing problem that in many states, as we learn to serve handicapped students in mainstream settings, regulations dictate the cutoff of special education funds. We must face the question of why regular educators should negotiate new arrangements with special educators -- as seems inevitable under Public Law 94-142 -- when all the special funds must go elsewhere. We will have to deliver dollars if we want to continue our impact on regular education!

These examples illustrate my argument that the categorical approaches are not standing up. Funding systems and teacher education programs that are rigidly based on the extended categories have become a part of the problem rather than a part of the solution. The old rule of the professions - "first, do no harm" - is being violated in the ways we do our work. Almost everywhere, teachers and administrators are frustrated by the classification and funding systems we use and their call for reform is mounting!

Some Approaches to Solutions

We should have no great difficulties, I believe, in continuing our categorical approach to children who are totally blind, profoundly deaf, severely retarded, and multiply handicapped. Such children require interventions (instruction) that are distinct and highly specialized. As we learn to think in ATI (aptitude-treatment-interaction) terms, we recognize clearly that such students need to be identified and given specialized forms of instruction. It is also clear that some of the people who offer instruction to children in these categories will need to be trained for careers in highly specialized work, such as teaching language to the deaf or mobility to the blind. The traditional classification schemes in these domains make good educational sense.

The same cannot be said of students who fall into the extended or residual categories. In many such cases, the children's "exceptionalities" are of less importance than their other characteristics in decisions on curriculum and instructional modes. The diagnostic and treatment problems among these children bear only limited relations to the traditional categorizations of, for example, educable retarded,

hard of hearing, emotionally disturbed, or learning disabled. We do not have a sufficient knowledge base to justify all the trouble and expense of delivering such children to separate places by category for instruction by teachers trained by category.

So What Can We Do?

What I think we must do is summarized as follows:

1. Continue the specialized training and deployment of specialists in the education of deaf, blind, and severely/multiply handicapped children. Present patterns in the field of speech-language pathology also should be continued. This recommendation assumes that deaf, blind, and multiply handicapped children and those with major speech problems will continue to be identified by category, as will their special teachers be.

2. Generic special educators who are expert in diagnosis and intensive forms of instruction in the basic skills should be trained in consultation processes so they can be deployed in a decentralized manner throughout school systems. They would work both directly (with children) and indirectly (through consultation with teachers) in cases of children who are not responding well to existing forms of instruction. Such children would not be labeled in the traditional ways. This corps of generic special educators would need to be backed up by specialized consultants/scholars in such fields as psychology, behavior analysis, educational audiology, and speech-language pathology.

3. Special educators should be deployed for much earlier help to such exceptional children as the blind, deaf, or multiply handicapped, and, also, those children who show incipient signs of difficulties - who are not responding well to ordinary learning situations. The deployment would include work in homes as well as in formal school situations, and the latter definitely should include collaborative arrangements with regular teachers. Special educators should spend more time studying and treating the children who are not responding well to the initial phases of instruction in academic skill areas. Children served in our early education settings should not be categorized or labeled in traditional ways; they could be characterized, perhaps, as "at risk" in some sense.

4. We should work hard to establish statistical bases for accountability in special education as an alternative to child labeling systems. For example, we should create systems that demonstrate statistically that the deployment of special educators at the primary level school programs results in reducing the rate of learning problems. These statistics would reveal the fallacy of waiting until the children become full blown casualties who can be labeled and supported by categorical funds. This recommendation should make it possible to deal with "high risk" populations at early childhood levels where we rightly are quite reluctant to label children.

5. We should work toward developing and funding plans that focus on school systems, when it is appropriate, rather than on the clinical identification of children. For example, if a large city school shows a high percentage of children in difficulty, we should advocate something like an "IEP" for the whole school. This approach would channel special education money on the basis of needs identified at systems level. If it seems inappropriate for all special education problems to be considered clinical rather than systemic, and I argue that it is inappropriate, then why do we not support better and more appropriate ways to use special education funds?

6. We should shift attention away from the individual child as the funding unit. Emphasis on the labeled individual as funding unit leads to the "bounty hunt" and enclave mentality by which you get more money for waiting for lots of casualties and then segregating them. Instead, special education funding should move either to personnel or to programmatic units. We must relocate the triggering mechanism on special education dollar flow to a unit other than child-in-labeled-category so that special educators can be deployed in preventive as well as remedial/compensatory functions and strong support systems can be created for exceptional students wherever they are served. Only then will we be able to provide the full range of services that exceptional students require.

I believe that if we do not make something like the proposed kinds of changes in the categorizing/labeling of children and in our categorical funding systems, it is quite likely that special education will be forced back to something like its nineteenth century role: serving only blind, deaf, seriously retarded, and multiply handicapped youngsters. We will have lost our opportunities to carry out our broader mission - improving education for a broader clientele and moving toward a unified, total school system that has the accommodative power to deal with the full range of human differences.

Bibliography

Bernstein, C.D., Kirst, M.W., Hartman, W.T., & Marshall, R.S. Financing educational services for the handicapped. Reston VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.

Cromwell, R., Ethics, umbrage, and the ABCD's. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), Mainstreaming: Origins and implications. Reston VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1976

Cronbach, L.J., & Snow, R. Aptitudes and instructional methods. New York: Irvington, 1977.

Gallager, J.J. The sacred and profane uses of labeling. Mental Retardation. December 1976, 3-7.

Hobbs, N. The futures of children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Hunt, D.E. Person-environment interaction: A challenge found wanting before it was tried. Review of Educational Research, 1975, 45 (2), 209-230.

President's Committee on Mental Retardation. The six-hour retarded child. Washington DC: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, US Office of Education, US Government Printing Office, 1969.

Reynolds, M, & Birch, J. Teaching exceptional children in all American's schools. Reston VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978

Reynolds, M., & Balow, B. Categories and variables in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38 (5), 357-366.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Samuel Ashcroft: Maynard's discussion of the aptitude treatment interaction concept is an important one. I would like to make a plea for social policy research in this area to provide the information we need for changing our behavior, particularly in legislative matters. There has been wisdom in not drastically amending Public Law 94-142 over the past 3 years. But I think now the time has come when that legislation could be substantially improved by major modification. Congress needs social policy research and models to examine that will enable it to modify this legislation in ways that would be responsive to the important constructive criticisms Maynard has raised.

Dr. Romaine Mackie: Everywhere in the country there is a great surge of interest in instruction. But I find people have different things on their mind when they talk about good instructional programs. In some schools only reading, writing, and arithmetic are emphasized. Instruction has to be extremely varied to meet the needs of children in this country.

I am especially concerned about getting to the emotionally disturbed children. We are presently doing a disservice to these children. Look at the newspapers. Look at the juveniles going to court. I think we have to construct curriculums that will hold the interest of these children. In addition, we have a great deal of adjusting to do for many minority children if school is going to be interesting for them and not something they merely tolerate.

Dr. Philip Jones: One of the hangups that we have had in the field for many years is that the basis of special education funding unfortunately has dictated the organizational pattern. This is not so in general education. For example, within the various states even though they have a single state aid system, a lot of organizational patterns develop at the local level in many different ways. They may have schools with Grades K through 8 and high schools with grades 9 through 12. They may have middle schools, primary schools, intermediate schools, and so on. From that standpoint general education is way ahead of us. They do not let the funding mechanism dictate how they operate. This means that we do not necessarily have to label beyond the point of obtaining the funding. The organizational structure that we develop at the local levels is probably the key factor. When you describe the organizational structure on the state forms maybe you label it something that you actually prefer not to call it. But that is your trigger, your mechanism for getting the funding. This is a fact that has crossed my mind many times.

It also relates to the issue of educating children in the least restrictive or most productive environment. Many people misinterpret that concept by believing a mainstream program can be offered at a lesser cost than a special class. Consequently, groups of children are placed within regular education programs. The number of students served by one professional staff member increases four-or five-fold. Some teachers really cannot address the individual needs of that many children, which is what the law is all about. When we serve students in the least restrictive, most productive environment we may indeed be spending more on each child because it is an add on service.

Sometimes we are in a situation where we merely disperse children. To a certain extent we hide their category, and we do allow them to mix with nonhandicapped youngsters. But I am afraid the tragedy is going to hit us again. If we do not provide for their special and unique needs, we may get back students who are more of a problem then we sent in. I think we have to be very careful in that regard and make certain we do attend to the individual needs of children as opposed to the systems approaches that are developed in school districts.

Ms. Parthenia Smith: Most of us in education have a tendency to forget that there are other funding sources that can be integrated into our educational system. The arts have grants, the colleges have grants, and there are many other noneducational programs that could bolster education. We have to look at all support programs. General education people are doing this, and I think we in special education have to do it also, for prevention alone, if for no other reason. We need to find agencies where there is money and develop programs to prevent handicapping conditions. If we make our research available to people outside the educational community, it will call attention to the need to ease some of the economic and social factors that are contributing to handicapping conditions. The educational community is not the only source that can provide funding for these studies.

Mr. Harold Perry: We can get too smug as educators about the great services we provide children in this nation. We can reduce this smugness by thinking back to the years not too far removed when most of the services were instigated by parents and parent groups. Unfortunately, I find today, at least in my area, that there is a great deal of complacency and passivity that exists among parents and parent groups. I do not know why. Somehow we are going to have to join ranks with parents and make them realize that they can do much more than they have been doing of late. At the same time we have to stimulate parents and get them to come on and get with it and share the responsibility of providing appropriate services.

Dr. Merle Karnes: It seems that the dilemma we are in now is making us a little schizophrenic. In early childhood education we think of where the child is developmentally, what his needs are, and how we can best match the educational experiences with these special needs. And then all of a sudden someone says how many mentally retarded children do you have? How many partially sighted? If we do not categorize or classify these children our funding is in jeopardy. I do not know how we are going to get out of this dilemma. If we want funds, we are going to have to identify the children by specific categories. Otherwise, our funding agencies (especially legislators) may not believe us. We are in a particularly serious dilemma in early childhood education. We talk about the least restrictive environment and about working with children when they are most pliable and flexible. But we have no early childhood programs beginning at birth for nonhandicapped children. In effect, we segregate special children by labeling them as handicapped preschoolers.

I am very concerned about mainstreaming for handicapped children. We have moved so fast that we do not have some of the answers as to how to facilitate education in the least restrictive environment. In the first place we all know that special educators, unless they have had intensive inservice training or have gone back to school, have not been trained to interact with regular classes as consultants. It is a frightening situation for regular teachers because they do not know how to program for handicapped children. There are times we lean over backwards trying to take the stance that these children are not handicapped at all because we are so afraid of categorizing. We need to clarify what our working relationship should be for special educators and regular teachers in order to program appropriately for these children. I certainly make a plea for more research in the area of developing techniques and procedures for helping all teachers facilitate mainstreaming, so that it does not jeopardize the learning of nonhandicapped children, but on the other hand, enhances the learning of handicapped youngsters.

We need to constantly improve teacher training in our institutions of higher learning and we need intensive inservice for personnel in the public schools.

Dr. Reynolds' Comments: I appreciate the responses. There are some real issues here and it is good to talk about them. Events are occurring very rapidly. Children are coming out of their special enclaves and they are moving into less restrictive arrangements. The special schools are being closed down. They are not like they used to be. The special classes are not what they used to be. We do not own children.

However, we are in a position to negotiate new relationships. It seems to me that some of you are saying that special educators will be employed only when we have youngsters in specific categories. If you are going to wait until they are classified, you are not facing up to the declining rate of IEP's in the big cities, and the resentment and resistance of the minority community in having their children labeled. You have to face the problems. I get impatient with the administrator who says, "Well, give me the money." I recognize there are lots of problems. We have to face up to some basic conceptual problems or otherwise we are on a very short journey.

Is special education going to wait to begin services only after children are placed in categories? Are we not going to make contributions in the early programs where children live at risk? Is special education going to stay out of that? We have to get in there and think through and renegotiate our relationships. The traditional point at which we initiate intervention - the child in a clinical sense being labeled - is really not going to work.

Special educators have a contribution to make in early education well before they come to categorizing or labeling children. Let's find a mechanism, a means to get in there. Let's not assume that politicians are easily duped and we just have to go along with some well practiced scheme of getting some money from them. We have not worked through the basic conceptual problems ourselves nor have we communicated them to other people. It seems to me we are going to have to think through how these contributions can be made at early levels, how we can make contributions in large city situations and elsewhere without labeling. Not enough of us are doing the hard job of thinking it through and coming up with the alternatives and communicating these alternatives. I think we are on a dangerous journey. I meant what I said. Special education at best could return to the nineteenth century if we do not work through these issues conceptually as well as politically and practically.

ISSUES IN EARLY CHILDHOOD FOR THE HANDICAPPED

James J. Gallagher
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

It has become increasingly obvious that there are a variety of problems or unsolved issues related to early education for the handicapped. Many of these issues relate to program quality and appropriateness. These are issues to be debated in research and teaching settings, but I would like to address a simpler issue - namely, why are so few programs available for preschool handicapped children?

Lack of Preschool Program Development

Impressive evidence exists from child development research to demonstrate the long range impact of early experiences upon the developing child. This seems particularly true for the exceptional child whose normal development may be impeded by a variety of neurological insults or physiological problems. In these instances, those basic skills and patterns of behavior that are learned more or less naturally by the nonhandicapped child have to be deliberately planned for handicapped youngsters and their families in order for them to achieve the maximum of their remaining talents. Despite this almost universal understanding of the importance of early childhood years, such understandings have not been translated into programmatic efforts on a widespread basis.

A visitor from another planet would surely expect, knowing what we know, to see extensive resources and facilities provided for the preschool exceptional child. We can estimate the total number of preschool handicapped in the United States as 1,187,000, only 38% of whom are receiving some special service. So we ask ourselves, Why?

One of the most popular villains in a case of unfulfilled desires is the federal government, but in this instance we can hardly blame the "Feds." The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has targeted resources in an organized and comprehensive program of research, training, a major demonstration program, and strong technical assistance to build a continuing interest in the preschool handicapped child. Much of what we know from a professional education standpoint about programs for preschool exceptional children and their families has emerged out of this major programmatic initiative on the part of one federal agency. Yet until we solve the structural problems that seem to inhibit program development, it seems unlikely that preschool handicapped children will benefit from the results of this work as much as they ought to.

Jursidictional Disputes

One major block has been the question, To whom does the preschool handicapped child really belong? The naive observer would say the child belongs to the family, but we all know that that is not the real issue. The real issue is, Does the preschool handicapped child

belong to the Department of Human Resources or to the Department of Public Instruction? There is a jurisdictional dispute of major proportions that is being finessed at the present time by the simple strategy of neither agency moving forward to institutionalize such services. Thus, programs for preschool children turn out to be "demonstration" programs or programs of limited duration with little expectation of their continuance beyond a certain end date.

I would propose a simple minded solution to such jurisdictional disputes and assign arbitrarily, in a Solomon-like decision, the responsibility for handling handicapped children under 3 years of age to Departments of Human Resources around the country. The Department of Public Instruction would then have the responsibility of dealing with the exceptional youngsters beyond the age of 3. I am aware that such a division of authority would not always benefit every individual concerned, but it is a way of assigning responsibility so that the officials can go about the business of planning programs, knowing that they will have the responsibility for their development and implementation on a continuing basis.

Another structural reason for the lack of program development may be the inability of preschool programs to integrate into one of the major service bureaucracies either in the public schools or social services. Thus, the strong impetus of Public Law 94-142 does not really extend over into the preschool age, and its impact is felt mainly in the established bureaucracy of the public schools. The preschool incentive grants have hardly been motivation enough to dramatically increase services to preschool handicapped children. Harrassed school administrators might even wish to avoid getting into preschool program issues on the grounds that they already have trouble enough with individualized education programs.

Need for Different Strategies

Another issue of major proportion involves the need to initiate a different kind of strategy than we have been used to in special education. One might contrast the clinical approach of dealing with a specific individual with the public health approach in dealing with children and family problems. Through the clinical approach in which most of us were trained, individual children are identified as handicapped. They are carefully tested for strengths and weaknesses in their developmental pattern, and a special program is designed to help the youngsters develop to the optimum of their capabilities. The clinical approach assumes that all problems essentially stem from some defect within the child and that the child needs to be treated in an analogous fashion to a child who has some disease.

But for conditions such as mild mental retardation or behavioral disorders, a different strategy might, in fact, be needed. One such strategy might be a deliberate attempt to eradicate conditions of poverty or family disintegration, out of which come the vast majority of children who have mild mental retardation and mild behavioral problems.

There seems to be adequate evidence that improvement of the family situation results in improvement in the performance of youngsters. The review of Sameroff and Chandler (1975) indicates rather clearly the negative synergistic effect of poverty upon ordinary illness and crisis conditions. When poverty is combined with an illness, catastrophic results can occur with the child, whereas the same disease might leave middle class children relatively unaffected. This public health approach of improving the child through improving the background environment is foreign to our special education background and understanding, and we must reach out to cultural antiropologists, sociologists, and others who have a firmer grasp of how such larger interventions in this society can be made.

A professional organization such as The Council for Exceptional Children, which envelops a wide variety of disciplines, has a unique opportunity to bring forth a comprehensive plan. Therefore, I am suggesting that The Council for Exceptional Children initiate a multidisciplinary plan for program initiation and extension for preschool handicapped children. This plan would shape a broader understanding and base for what remains to be done to provide services needed by more than a million preschool handicapped youngsters.

Bibliography

Bronfenbrenner, U. Is early intervention effective? In M. Guttentag & E. Streuning (Eds.), Handbook of evaluation research (Vol. II). Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications, 1975.

Enscher. G., Blatt, B., & Winschel, J. Headstart for the handicapped: Congressional mandate audit. Exceptional Children, 1977, 43, 202-210.

Frankenburg, W. Considerations for screening. In N. Ellis & L. Cross (Eds.), Planning programs for early education for the handicapped. New York: Walker & Co., 1977.

Kakalik, J., Brewer, G., Dougharty, L., Fleischauer, P., Genensky, S., & Wallen, L. Improving services to handicapped children. Santa Monica CA: Rand Corp., 1974.

Kirk, S. A. The early education of the mentally retarded. Urbana IL: University of Illinois Press, 1958.

Kirk, S., & Gallagher, J. Educating exceptional children (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Lazar, I., Hubbell, V.R., Murray, H., Rosche, M., & Royce, J. The persistence of preschool effects: A long-term followup of fourteen infant and preschool experiments (Final report for grant #18-76-07843). Ithaca NY: Cornell University, Community Service Laboratory, September, 1977.

Martin, E.W. A national commitment to the rights of the individual - 1776-1976. Exceptional Children, 1976. 43, 132-134.

Sarason, S. Carroll, C., Maton, K., Conen, S., & Lorentz, E. Human services and resource networks. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Maynard Reynolds: One of our major problems is that we tend to start right off assuming that we have a static group, that they are clearly identifiable in some clinical sense, and that all we have to do is look for definitive attributes of the children. We have not gone beyond the clinical concept of the handicapped, even in the schools, let alone in the fields of health and welfare. We tend to get stymied. Notice the great difficulties of the last few years at the point of identification, all the arguments that developed, and all the organizations that got involved in labeling children particularly in these tender early years.

Now when we are dealing with characteristics that are not so obvious, I think that one of our major problems is that we have not learned about approaches other than a strictly clinical approach. We have not learned to communicate about children who are at high risk. We have not learned to deal with accountability in a way that has reduced the rate and prevalence of problems in a community. We have a big job in front of us to educate ourselves and to get leaders and policy makers to understand concepts of children that risk funding systems that are more broadly framed, and which are ecologically oriented.

Dr. Philip Jones: I find your paper quite interesting, particularly when you delved into the bureaucratic aspects of the interrelationships of various departments at the state level. You have a very key point there. However, I think we are overlooking another area of concern in many states that also gets into the bureaucratic hassle within higher education. Just whom does the preschool handicapped child belong to? Whom does the certification program belong to within the institutes of higher learning? Is it Home Economics, Child Development, Special Education or Public Health? This is an issue that we definitely need to address.

We cannot blame the "Feds" here either. I endorse your position that the federal government has been very supportive of early childhood efforts. Public Law 94-142 is written in such a way that the state education agency (SEA) has the ultimate responsibility for program development and program operation. The SEA's are monitored by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the Office of Education. I think this is a critical factor. From that standpoint P. L. 94-142 really did not shift responsibility. The SEA's had this responsibility before and had not lived up to it. If you really

want to get this issue up and running I think the SEA level is where you have to seek it out.

Mr. William Geer: It has been unusual that the structure for management and development of preschool children has been primarily developed at the federal level before it has been developed elsewhere. The structure of administration, treatment, and education has had a hard time getting going among the state education agencies. They are probably the slowest group of public servants to accept responsibility of a new type. There is simply not built into state legislatures the incentives for starting new programs that there are in the federal government and in local governments. Interested citizens of local governments can be powerful in getting things to move. But unfortunately those same forces at state governmental levels have a difficult time pulling themselves together and getting on with the program.

I think you have to mount a movement as Jim has suggested to inform every possible public figure about the potential productivity and the cost effectiveness of early childhood education.

Ms. Parthenia Smith: I would like to address the component that talks about social factors. In many of the schools the minority children are the ones who are being classified and are receiving a larger portion of special education. I think that the lower economic groups in our population must be considered a minority, not unlike a racial minority. We need to work closely with the human resources and many of our community support agencies and public welfare agencies to see what we can do because we are not improving social conditions at this point in time. We must find some way to counsel parents. We must find some way to work with children who do not have parents. We must find some way to feed children, because the deprivation of low socioeconomic children between birth and age 5 makes a lot of special education placement necessary that would not occur if we dealt with those conditions.

Dr. John Kidd: I see many encouraging signs of involvment in early childhood education for the handicapped. The most recent and perhaps most striking is the resolution that appeared on the floor of CEC's delegate assembly yesterday concerning the prevention of mental retardation. The last paragraph of that resolution called for the Council to actively support legislation that eliminates from the environment those substances and conditions that produce disabling and handicapping conditions.

I see this resolution as an important historical event and it was so proclaimed from the floor by one of our speakers. CEC asked the Division on Mental Retardation to study this resolution and bring back a recommendation. I think that move was notable and at the same time exhilarating.

Dr. Merle Karnes: I feel positive about the development of early childhood education for the handicapped. That does not mean I do not see a lot of issues and unanswered questions. But when I think back, the big movement was initiated in 1968 when the Early Childhood Assistance Act was passed. The federal government provided us leadership, and in the last 10 years this program has grown remarkably all over the country. The federal government typically funds a program for about 3 years and then says, "Goodbye. Good luck." Then the program usually dies on the vine. But built into the Handicapped Children's Early Education programs was the stipulation that anyone receiving a grant would have to have a funding agency. I understand very few of them have terminated just because of the federal government. After 3 years the federal government studied the programs and funded the exemplary ones for another 3 years. The parents have been the stalwarts behind the legislation. Perhaps we need even more parent advocates of young children.

I am all for interagency responsibility for young children. I am concerned about the training. There is a great shortage in this field. I think we should encourage research on our accountability and evaluation. Some of these exemplary programs could become models for all special education. Lastly, I am especially concerned about those preschool handicapped children who have unusual gifts and talents. We have been sorely overlooking the needs of these youngsters.

Dr. William Johnson: Speaking from a school administrator's point of view, I realize that these are needed services and a responsibility that many schools should assume. We are experiencing decreasing enrollments now, so we have the space for preschool programs, but the money is a real problem. In our particular state preschool funding is at the 50% level so this means the local school district has to make up the other 50% if they are to provide services. Often times the lack of money prevents a school district from taking action. I think there has to be a cooperative endeavor.

Dr. Gallagher's Comments: I would like to react to a number of the comments because I think they helped enrich and broaden the discussion. Let me start with Maynard Reynolds' statements on the high risk population. It seems to me that we need to take an approach similar or analogous to that of the health professions and the insurance companies in regard to actuarial populations. We have populations in this society that are at risk for heart disorder, or at risk for cancer, or at risk for a large number of problems. We understand what the associative factors are for those conditions, but we do not know which individual in a particular group is going to be struck with the condition. We have a similar situation in our field. We know the conditions that predispose youngsters to be at risk for educational problems, but we cannot put our finger on which youngster will develop those problems. We cannot use our critical identification techniques and our prescriptive teaching procedures because we do not know which child is eligible.

When we are in the business of trying to prevent debilitating conditions, we have a different situation. Maybe the rules of the game have to be thought through again in terms of who is and who is not eligible for services under certain circumstances.

Merle Karnes mentioned parents. I think there are two things that could stimulate this kind of integration between the professions that everyone wants to have happen. Certainly one of them is that the parents could become active and literally say, "Look, you fight about something else, but do not fight about my child. You get together and settle this thing and get services to these children." Parents' groups have every right to do that and I really hope they are successful.

About the matter of who is responsible, there is no reason to believe just because the major administrative responsibility is in the area of human resources that the responsibility of educators is reduced. It simply means that you must have some administrative base for this sort of thing. I have had the rare opportunity of working closely with the medical profession in the last 5 years and I am very optimistic about the type of pediatricians that are being trained these days. I think they are fine, caring individuals and I think that they are much more ready to work with related professions, not as "master" doctors to subservient people, but in a team relationship where they realize that they do not know everything and there are other people who can bring important factors to bear upon a given situation. There is no reason why we should have to say goodbye to all those valuable professions from the social work and medical and health areas just because the preschool child is not the sole responsibility of the school system. We need to have a concept of primary-secondary responsibility that should fit within the service delivery program.

Another observation I would like to make is in the area of social policy analysis and research. At the University of North Carolina we were fortunate to get support from the Bush Foundation to conduct a training program in social policy analysis for both midcareer people and doctoral students. This involves the integration of a program from about 13 different academic departments such as political science, economics, maternal and child health, pediatrics, law, and education. The goal of this program is to bring what we know from academia to bear on major social policies and social issues. The Bush Foundation, incidentally, is also supporting centers at Michigan, at UCLA, and at Yale. Our people are doing studies on the effect of citizen participation in the policy of neighborhood health centers, the effect of the Supreme Court decisions on the child justice system in the United States, the effect of the one parent family on the development of the child, the effect of competency tests on exceptional children, and a variety of studies of that sort. I think that what we are calling for here is a kind of policy analysis, not just of children and children's development, but of what we know about organizations and bureaucracies, how in fact programs get initiated, and how we translate and organize the health delivery system, the

educational system, and the other systems in our society - toward a specific purpose. We should bring in consultants who are specialists in organizational theory, and the structure of bureaucracies and government at the state and federal level, and try to use the benefit of the wisdom that is collectively available to us, since none of us singlehandedly has all we need to bring to bear on this issue of exceptional children.

One final point: It seems to me that money is both a problem and a symptom. The lack of money is symptomatic of a lack of visible interest and pressure. I do not see public school administrators panting at the opportunity to initiate programs for preschool children, handicapped or nonhandicapped. Think of the opportunities they also have to start early childhood programs for the gifted. They are not fighting their way to the state legislature to plead for those either. There is a reason for the lack of money. It is because all too few pressure groups are pushing hard on legislatures to provide that money. Public Law 94-142 had a number of prior versions, and the way it came out, especially the preschool part, is somewhat reflective of the pressures or the lack of pressures that were laid on in this particular area. So I do not want people to walk away and say, "Gee, if only we had the money everything would be all right." There is a reason why we do not have the money, and we need to think about that, also.

A NEW INTERNATIONAL ROLE FOR CEC

Samuel C. Ashcroft
Peabody College

Prologue

This is the International Year of the Child. 1979 presents unique opportunities to celebrate children, to focus on critical needs of children, and to seek creative solutions to their problems so that all children may more fully achieve their potential. The United Nations' Declaration of the Rights of the Child, provides appropriate goals for the International Year of the Child: Children have

The right to affection, love, and understanding
The right to free education
The right to full opportunity for play and recreation
The right to a name and nationality
The right to special care, if handicapped
The right to be among the first to receive relief in times of disaster
The right to be a useful member of society and develop individual abilities
The right to be brought up in a spirit of peace and universal brotherhood
The right to enjoy these rights, regardless of race, color, sex, religion, national or social origin.

We in special education have a special obligation to children, particularly those who are handicapped and gifted. We have an unparalleled opportunity to achieve progress during the International Year of the Child. In the interest of promoting such progress the following proposals are made concerning CEC's international role.

Premises

1. Children who are handicapped and children who are gifted everywhere would benefit from increased international cooperation and activity in special education.

2. The United States has much to gain as well as much to contribute through international cooperation.

3. CEC should provide leadership in the development of international activities in behalf of exceptional children and special education.

4. CEC and the Foundation for Exceptional Children should work in close cooperation in the development of an international program. The program should be a joint program of CEC and FEC.

5. The international program of the Council and the Foundation should in no way impair domestic programs of the Council or the Foundation nor diminish the resources allocated to them.

Introduction

The Council for Exceptional Children has a distinguished history in services to exceptional children and special education at home and abroad. Until 1958 CEC was known as the International Council for Exceptional Children. At that time, in order to focus its efforts on domestic programs and to maximize its credibility with the US Congress and other governmental components, CEC dropped International from its name and diminished the international emphasis. Now in the period immediately following the First World Congress on Future Special Education sponsored by CEC at Stirling, Scotland, June, 1978, it seems fitting to make some proposals for consideration concerning CEC's international roles. The World Congress and the resulting publication, International Perspectives on Future Special Education, (Fink, 1978), are milestones in the Council's history of international activity. Dedicated to the International Year of the Child, 1979, the publication includes papers selected from more than 200 received by CEC for the World Congress. The text also provides a summary of the deliberations of the Futures Roundtable, the best thinking of special educators from around the world. Included are 12 Suggested Future Cooperative International Activities as well as task force recommendations regarding what could be done to promote the education of exceptional children during and following the International Year of the Child. The 12 suggested activities are as follows:

1. The creation of an international world body concerning the education of exceptional children.

2. The creation of a Council of World Organizations on the education of the handicapped.

3. The creation of an International Clearinghouse on Research, Information, and Materials.

4. The planning and conducting of international meetings including those which may be topical and/or regional.

5. The creation of an international competition for effective practices and activities with subsequent dissemination of those selected.

6. The development of international special educators (internationalists).

7. The initiation of efforts to encourage greater attention to the education of exceptional children and their needs by international governing bodies such as UNESCO, UNICEF, and OAS, by undertaking such activities as:

a. Strengthening and expanding their total efforts.

b. Incorporating the needs of exceptional children within the UNICEF sponsored Year of the Child.

c. Monitoring the implementation of and compliance with the policies of such bodies pertaining to exceptional children.

8. The production of a comprehensive list and description of higher education programs in special education throughout the world.

9. The identification and description of criteria for initial personnel selection and standards regarding training programs.

10. The establishment of personnel exchange programs including researchers.

11. The creation of an international "think tank" with a limited number of participants from each nation to explore solutions to problems regarding the education of exceptional youth.

12. The design and establishment of research resource centers in all nations. (Fink, 1978, p. 5)

It is gratifying to know that the leadership of the Council, officers as well as headquarters staff, have been engaged in preliminary steps to implement some of the recommended activities. We applaud their interest in international efforts and the IYC. It is in the interest of stimulating further activity by the Council both for the International Year of the Child and for other long term international roles that the following issues are suggested for further consideration.

Proposals

All of the recommendations of the World Congress are worthy of consideration. However, to attempt to implement every one would be overly ambitious. The proposals presented here seem to represent a reasonable and possible plan of action.

The Council for Exceptional Children should undertake a vigorous program of development of international activities cooperatively with the Foundation for Exceptional Children and other domestic and foreign agencies. A small headquarters Unit of International Activities should be established and staffed.

To underwrite international activities that would be promoted or implemented by the CEC Unit on International Activities, a plan should be developed to establish corporate membership for various agencies, governments, and other entities both in foreign countries and in the United States. Corporate memberships would provide a

single point of contact for cooperative and exchange efforts with other countries. Corporate memberships should be mutually understood to encourage and to promote rather than to supplant the development of CEC-like organization in other countries. Units should be of adequate size and number to provide substantial revenue to support international activities. The funds accruing from corporate memberships would be used to underwrite activities including the exchange of technical assistance with other countries; supporting development of an International Clearinghouse for Information on Teaching, Research, and Service; encouraging the exchange of students, teachers, professors, and administrators; and initiating the Information Exchange proposed in 1970.

Priority should be given to the international exchange of information. Efforts in this area were given impetus in 1970 when a small conference of experts from Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, and the United States was convened in Copenhagen by CEC to discuss an international exchange of information in special education. The Executive Director of CEC, William Geer, who participated in that conference, recently said, "It was years ahead of its time." The time now seems right for rapid implementation of the International Exchange of Information in special education. This effort should be carefully started to assure visible success as a precursor to launching other international initiatives. The Scandinavian agreement provides a basis for the development in this area.

The International Activities program should provide for the exchange of technical assistance in the administrative organization of CEC, as well as in the professional membership councils and divisions of the organization. This will encourage the development of CEC counterpart organizations in other countries. In exchanging technical assistance with countries desiring to develop CEC counterpart organizations, CEC and the Foundation should encourage the development of a World Council of such organizations in accordance with the recommendation from the World Congress.

Strong support should also be given to the proposal for World Regional Conferences in England and South America currently being considered and explored, in accordance with the recommendation from the World Congress Roundtable. As plans evolve for these Regional World Conferences leading ultimately to a second World Congress in special education, consideration should be given to providing leadership for the establishment of a concurrent International Year for Handicapped and Gifted Children. Consideration should be given to providing special auspices for this International Year to retain its independence, yet to have it develop in such a way as to take advantage of any strength that organizational support from other agencies might provide.

CEC's International Unit should serve as an advocate and facilitator for professionals in special education who engage in work with other countries. Professor Fifield of Utah State University has proposed a project with Chile that could serve

as a prototype for demonstrating the possibilities for advocacy and facilitation. The International Unit should not engage in the management or control of such projects. Likewise it should disclaim responsibility for the success, benefits, failures, or detriments accruing from such work.

As one of its early projects the Unit on International Activities should undertake the development of standards and guidelines for the exchange of technical assistance, and the exchange of information, students, teachers, professors, and administrators.

The Unit should become a source of technical assistance to American professionals who have opportunities to work with other countries. It could provide linkage and advocacy with other agencies and become a source of technical assistance in special education. Examples of such appropriate agencies would be Partners of the Americas, The Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, various United Nations agencies and similar public and private groups.

CEC's Unit on International Activities should solicit from CEC's membership voluntary filing of information on international activity in which members engage. Thus, CEC should build an extensive file of reports written by professionals working abroad; facilitate the publication and exchange of such reports; provide information regarding National planning in other nations; and develop a "talent bank" consisting of a list of professionals with various competencies that can be referred to countries requesting assistance.

Summary

In summary, CEC should consider the following recommendations:

1. Undertake a vigorous program of international activities cooperatively with the Foundation for Exceptional Children and other domestic and foreign agencies.

2. Finance international activities through a plan for corporate membership.

3. Give priority to the development of a program of international exchange of information.

4. Provide for the exchange of technical assistance in various areas of endeavor and to encourage the development of CEC counterpart organizations in other countries.

5. Work toward development of a world council of CEC-like organizations.

6. Provide strong support to the proposal for World Regional Conferences in England and South America.

7. Plan for a second World Congress in special education.

8. Give consideration to the development of an International Year for Handicapped and Gifted Children to coincide with the second World Congress.

9. Serve as an advocate for and facilitator of activities of professionals in special education who come to work with the United States or who go to work in other countries.

10. Develop standards and guidelines for the exchange of technical assistance for international activities.

11. Serve as a clearinghouse for information on international activities of professionals working abroad.

It would be appropriate for CEC in cooperation with the Foundation for Exceptional Children to inaugurate a new program of international activities in this the International Year of the Child. I solicit the support of past presidents of CEC and FEC and the past presidents of CEC chapters, federations, provinces, councils, and divisions to join in support of a program to help handicapped and gifted children and youth achieve their full potential.

Bibliography

Armfield, A.H. CEC's 1st World Congress on future special education. Exceptional Children, 1977, 43, 386-389.

Ashcroft, S.C. Proposal: An international children's year. Exceptional Children, 1970-71, 37, 553.

Chanlett, E., & Morier, G.M. Declaration of the rights of the child (Reprint). International Child Welfare Review, 1968, 22.

Fink, A. H. (Ed.). International perspectives on future special education. First World Congress on Future Special Education, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - June 30, 1973. Reston VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Jorgensen, I. K., & Langelyth, J. International Information Exchange in Special Education. Meeting of experts from Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and United States. Copenhagen, Denmark, August, 1970.

Smith, P. Up front with the President. Exceptional Children, 1979, 45, 325.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Romaine Mackie: We must keep abreast in some official way with developments in other countries. Actually, we are obligated to do so. A good momentum is underway with the cooperation between CEC and the European Association for Special Education (EASE).

Also we must recognize and work with UNESCO, which does have a center for the handicapped. I would like to see what we can do to throw our resources behind them, too. I am all for CEC and the Foundation for Exceptional Children going international because we have a lot to learn from other people and we have a good deal to give to them as well.

Let us remember that education developed in a culture and it reflects the culture in which it developed. Ours is different from anyone else's. These differences will be very interesting to us as we move more and more into international activities. I hope that we will take more leadership responsibility. I think it would be a very great endeavor.

Dr. Wyatt: Dr. Jones is on the Board of Directors of the Foundation. Would you like to comment on the Foundation, Phil?

Dr. Philip Jones: Sam, I theoretically support the kinds of things you are saying. I support the notion of the corporate membership, but I think that unfortunately we in CEC have gone off in too many directions at times and got ourselves overmortgaged, on a financial basis. Certainly I would like to see world wide cooperation. But I guess I would come back and ask, "Are the structures already in place?" Romaine mentioned UNESCO. You mentioned IRSEN. Are these structures that we can work within? From the standpoint of CEC developing an international unit within the headquarters office I think it is not unlike many of the new ventures we get into within CEC. Could we not talk about all of the units devoting a little attention to that component as opposed to having one fixed point that would need to be staffed and would cause dollar outlay?

We did talk a few years ago about establishing international divisions. One of the reasons people wanted to create an international division was so that there could be something like the World Congress. I think we demonstrated you do not need a division on international special education to have a World Congress. Although I do not see a World Congress on Special Education happening every year, I think that is something that comes around periodically and is very valuable. Maybe working through these other structures and agencies CEC should be involved in that, certainly should be participating in that. But I question the fiscal commitment at this point unless we find a wealthy benefactor who could underwrite the costs involved.

So, that is where I am. It may be a hard nosed approach. I see a lot of value in it, but I think we have a real fiscal problem within CEC if we keep trying to do everything for everybody.

Dr. Wyatt: Parthenia, you participated in the Roundtable Discussion in Scotland. Maybe you have some impressions you would like to share.

Ms. Parthenia Smith: The one thing that I found so stimulating and so enlightening was the conclusion of the Roundtable that every country represented had basically the same problems and the same priorities. It has led me to believe that CEC must develop some mechanism by which an international exchange can take place, especially in research and in the exchange of ideas and professional personnel. I think that the international unit in CEC would not necessarily have to be a unit in a concrete sense as, for example, the publications or conventions units are. But it could be a unit in the sense that it provides a mechanism by which we can accomplish the goals that we are striving to accomplish. It means utilizing some already established agencies and organizations such as foundations. I feel that Sam has outlined a plan here that we can take back to CEC, and given CEC's present resources, see how we can integrate these particular ideas into the concept of an international unit, and go from there.

The Roundtable was a fantastic thing. I think it established a base from which we can move forward. I would encourage everybody to get involved in an international perspective. Some of the placements of children in special programs is a result of their foreign background. The United States is getting more and more children from other countries or from other cultural backgrounds that have difficulty fitting into our American educational system. Therefore, they are being classified or labeled as needing special services. If the United States can incorporate into its educational system more understanding and knowledge of international education, we may reduce the number of children receiving special education merely because of their cultural differences.

Dr. John Kidd: Sam asserted that the constitution of CEC restricts membership to United States citizens or residents and Canadians. In my recollection, the constitution refers to the United States and Canada only one time. That has to do with exceptional children's education in the United States and Canada. I think the restriction of membership to the United States and Canada came about (a) through the recent instability in the international fiscal markets and the difficulty of even trying to keep track of international memberships and (b) a decision by the executive committee, who simply announce that it is essentially a constitutional matter.

This leads me to what I hope is a constructive comment. The very nature of our professions and our lives and our commitment says we would like to help all kinds of children everywhere. But our legal

and fiscal responsibility says that to what ever extent we get involved in international affairs we should be guided by the probable benefit to the children back here in the United States and Canada. And I think appreciable benefits can accrue to our domestic programs. The Division on Mental Retardation requested the editor of our journal, Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, to seek out and utilize appropriate materials on the international aspects of educating mentally retarded individuals. So we are beginning to get involved.

Dr. Wyatt: Merle, you were in Scotland, too.

Dr. Merle Karnes: I thoroughly enjoyed attending and participating in the World Congress and I want to thank Sam for sharing with us his ideas and recommendations. I think we have to think much longer and plan most thoughtfully as to how to get more involved in the international scene. We would not want to pull apart by any divergent thinking. Funds needed to carry out the ideas would not necessarily have to come directly from CEC and the membership. If we worked out a viable plan many sources of funding might help us implement it.

I jotted down here an idea about CEC including information in their publications on exemplary programs and research in other countries. John has just mentioned that the Division on Mental Retardation is urging the very same thing. This might be something the Foundation could really spearhead and promote, or at least some activities of the Foundation could focus on developing close international ties. And it occurred to me that we have had many students and leaders from other countries visit the programs in this country. We already have a network of friends all over the globe that might be very interested and could seek funds in their own countries. So we would not have to do it all by ourselves. In fact it is not going to be effective if we think we are going to take over and carry the ball for all activities of an international nature. That would be opposed to a cooperative effort.

Dr. Maynard Reynolds: We would have to approach our problems in some very different contexts than we are accustomed to here in the States. We would have to deal with mental retardation, behavior problems, and learning disabilities in the broadest possible kind of framework. Here there would be another reason for us to think awfully hard about some of the things we discussed earlier this morning - concerns of health, social welfare, economic development.

Dr. Wyatt: Any more comments from the participants?

Dr. Mackie: Throughout all of our discussions today I have been thinking more about general education. How much have we as a profession changed general education? We ought to think about this. What kind of environment have we created for all children? How can we foster more interaction between general and special education? How much has it grown? How much have we grown?

Dr. Wyatt: That may be a topic we ought to bring up in our planning session for next year's Statesmen's Roundtable. We are just about to move to that unless there is a comment from the audience.